



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,424	10/18/2005	Masashi Tamura	1163-0536PUS1	1484

2292 7590 11/26/2008
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

NEWMAN, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/26/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

This is a summary of the substance of a series of telephonic conversations the last of which took place on November 18th, 2008. Applicant's Representative was advised that the remarks submitted on June 19th, 2008, regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 of claims 1, 3 and 4 (and also applicable to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 8) were persuasive in differentiating the claims over the prior art. Claims 1 - 4 and 8 thus appeared to be in condition for allowance. Applicant's Representative was also advised that the remarks, regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of claims 5 - 7 and 9, were not persuasive and that the rejection was proper and being maintained. Specifically, the reasoning, previously summarized in the Interview Summary mailed May 9th, 2008 (Paper No. 20080430), regarding the interpretation of the term 'feature value', was maintained. However, Applicant's Representative submitted that the interpretation was inconsistent with the definition recited in the specification. Applicant's Representative was advised that although the claims are examined in light of the specification, it is improper to import limitations from the specification into the claims. Applicant's Representative was thus advised to either explicitly define the term 'feature value' in the claims or to cancel claims 5 - 7 and 9 to quickly place the case in condition for allowance. Applicant's Representative declined, indicating that they would proceed to appeal the rejections of claims 5 - 7 and 9.